



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,757	03/24/2000	Mark Edward Sweat	30566.79USU1	2752

22462 7590 11/10/2003

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

FLYNN, KIMBERLY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/534,757

Applicant(s)

SWEAT ET AL.

Examiner

Kimberly D Flynn

Art Unit

2153

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-45.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments with respect to Burrows and Wishnie are not persuasive. Applicant(s) argue on page 8 of the remarks, that neither Burrows nor Wishnie teach disclose or suggest an integrated project for organizing folders for one or more architectural projects. The applicant(s) arguments are not persuasive. Although Wishnie et al. is not a CAD system, Wishnie discloses a hierarchical organization of files for a website, and the concept of utilizing folders for storing files.

Applicant(s) argue on page 8 of the remarks, that neither Burrows nor Wishnie teach, disclose or suggest an integrated project workspace to help personnel manage files related to architectural projects. The applicant(s) arguments are not persuasive. The term architectural has been given the broadest reasonable interpretation. By its nature, CAD design drawings are inherently related to some type of architectural structure, whether it is for mechanical objects, electrical objects, buildings, etc. Thus, the term architectural, when used in the context of CAD systems, does not further limit CAD-based files.

Applicant(s) argue on page 13 of the remarks that Burrows fails to teach, disclose or suggest project members of one or more projects. The applicant(s) arguments are not persuasive. The users of the files, 57, in Fig. 3 of Burrows et al. clearly show three different site members who have their own respective access to the CAD server, even they have not been named "site members" within the reference. Additionally, the CAD tasks of each user have been interpreted as projects, even though the word "project" isn't being specifically mentioned.

Applicant(s) argue on page 13 of the remarks that Burrows fails to describe a separate site members area and a project area, thus it does not read on the claimed invention. The applicant(s) arguments are not persuasive. In the claimed language, there has been no distinction made between site members and project members, as the site members have not been described in the independent claims. In fact, project members are only mentioned in the independent claims, leading one to believe that site member can be, and are, project members, since the dependent claims refer to defining access permissions and such for the site members only.

Applicant(s) argue on page 13 of the remarks the Burrows fail to teach, disclose, or suggest an area of the web site that provides the ability to organize and modify project members of one or more projects. The examiner has expanded upon the previous rejection to more clearly point out the inherent use of folders for storing, organizing, and displaying CAD programs (drawings and text files), as claims 2, 16 and 31.